

TECHNICAL SERVICES AND SUPPORT CONTRACT

**68-W9-8106
(68-W-98-106)**

DYNCORP I&ET, INC

SFUND RECORDS CTR
2159795**REQUEST FOR OFFER**

TASK ORDER NUMBER: #2

TASK ORDER TITLE: Support for NPL Updates

PROJECT OFFICER: Mary Ann Rich, (703) 603-8825

1. BACKGROUND

The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) enacted in 1980, and amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA), provide the Federal Government broad authority for responding to the dangers posed by uncontrolled releases of hazardous substances, pollutants, and contaminants. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) responded by developing the Hazard Ranking System (HRS), which is a scoring system used to establish the National Priorities List (NPL). On December 14, 1990 (55 FR 51532), EPA revised the HRS, as required by SARA. The revised HRS became effective on March 14, 1991. It is a more comprehensive and accurate scoring system than the original HRS and may add new types of sites to the NPL.

The State, Tribal, and Site Identification Center (ST/SI) in OERR is responsible for discovering sites, evaluating their potential threat to human health and the environment, implementing the HRS, and proposing and finalizing them to the NPL.

2. PURPOSE:

This Task Order (TO) provides technical support to EPA in the Agency's review of sites that are candidates for the NPL updates under the revised HRS. The purpose of the technical review, known as the Quality Assurance (QA) review, is to ensure that the technical basis used to support a site listing decision is consistent with the revised HRS rule as defined in the December 14, 1990 Federal Register, as well as EPA's technical guidance.

3. SCOPE OF WORK:

Task 1: Prepare and submit the information outlined in this request for offer and a cost proposal corresponding to the work outlined in this task order.

During the period of performance for this Task Order, the contractor shall conduct task order monitoring of the LOE and expenditures at the task level, quality assurance and management activities, including preparation of the monthly progress report, under this task. The monthly progress report should be itemized site-specifically where possible.

-2-

Task 2: QA Review

The EPA Headquarters Regional Coordinator (HQ RC) will provide the contractor with HRS Documentation Record packages following submittal to HQ by the EPA Regions. The contractor shall review the HRS packages to ensure that the HRS is properly and consistently applied. The contractor shall identify site package data gaps and shall support EPA in evaluating the adequacy of documentation supporting site scores to assure that the packages have the best chance of meeting legal challenges. The contractor shall anticipate review of up to 54 packages for all regions during Option Year One.

Priorities for QA: Upon receipt of each HRS site package, the contractor shall make a qualitative assessment of the major pathways and/or factors contributing most significantly to the overall risks/score as posed by the site, and prioritize the issues in terms of risk/contribution to score. The contractor shall then discuss this assessment with the HQ RC. If the contractor is uncertain of the level of review for pathways not contributing greatly to the overall score, they shall raise these concerns to the HQ RC. The contractor shall conduct the QA review based on the priorities identified by the EPA HQ TOM and in coordination with the HQ RC.

The contractor shall ensure that major contributing factors are technically defensible. The proportion of time spent during the QA review shall reflect the relative importance of the pathways and/or factors. The QA review shall be conducted for all information submitted in the HRS package, but the time taken to review portions of the package not contributing significantly to the overall site score shall be a small fraction of the time taken to review the significant portions of the site package.

Subtask 1 - QA Letter: After completion of QA on an HRS site package, the contractor shall prepare a QA letter for each one reviewed. If major issues arise, the contractor shall discuss them with the Regional NPL Coordinator and the HQ Regional Coordinator prior to submittal of the QA letter. The purpose of this letter is to provide Headquarters and the Region with written comments on problems or weaknesses in site HRS packages. These letters should be comprehensive, such that once all problems cited in the letter are addressed, the site package will be ready to pass QA (in absence of new QA issues). Before the QA letter is sent, if there are unresolved issues, the contractor shall prepare a synopsis of the issues, with recommendations on how to resolve them. Upon completion, each QA letter shall be sent to the appropriate HQ RC (who serves as task monitor), with copies going to the appropriate EPA NPL Coordinator in the region, and the EPA TOM. The NPL Coordinator will then make the necessary changes to the HRS package and resubmit the revised HRS package to the contractor. There may be several rounds of QA letters and resubmissions. After all issues are addressed and only editorial concerns remain, the contractor shall provide the Region with a "redlined" version showing the proposed corrections. Once the Region has signed off on these corrections, the contractor shall make these corrections, producing a final version the HRS Documentation Record. The format of QA letter shall be consistent with the outline of Attachment #1.

-3-

Subtask 2 - Conference Calls: Following issuance of QA letter, a member of the contractor's QA team shall participate in conference calls when necessary with EPA HQ and the Regions to clarify issues and discuss areas of disagreement. The frequency of the conference calls shall be based on the need. This frequency will vary by Region and number of packages undergoing QA. The contractor's QA team member designated to a particular Region shall be responsible for reviewing site packages and discussing QA issues during the conference call and shall have responsibility for reviewing the same site packages during any subsequent formal QA of the site package that takes place. The contractor shall provide the HQ RC, the NPL coordinator in the Region and the EPA TOM with conference call notes (telecons) within 3 days following the call.

Subtask 3 - Submission of Site HRS Packages for EPA Approval: When QA review is complete, all issues have been addressed, and the HRS package is ready for proposal to the NPL, the contractor shall assemble final site packages for submission for final EPA approval. The final package shall include: narrative summary, pathway score sheets, and HRS documentation record. The contractor shall be responsible for ensuring that the narrative summary reflects any changes in the package resulting from QA review. The final package shall be delivered to the EPA TOM.

Subtask 4 - Support for NPL Rule Publication: This task will be competed between the two contractors and awarded to one only.

The contractor shall support activities related to NPL rule publication. Since this subtask includes all sites and is thus not region-specific, the work is assigned to a single contractor. During Option Year 1, this subtask will be competed, and assigned to one contractor. These activities include:

- 1) Tracking concurrence letters from States and Governors to help EPA determine a site's eligibility for proposal to the NPL (the EPA TOM, NPL Coordinator, or HQ RC will forward these letters to the contractor. The contractor shall maintain a Governor/State concurrence letter tracking report).
- 2) Preparing public information documents including site narrative summaries and introductory information on "Description and Auxiliary Information" documents.
- 3) Preparing draft form letters which shall be delivered in electronic format to the EPA TOM for members of Congress so that EPA may notify them of the Agency's intent to propose or add sites to the NPL that are in their State or Congressional District. EPA will provide the contractor with a list of Representatives prior to preparation of the correspondence.

Task 3: Regional Visits

The contractor shall accompany the HQ RC on visits to each of the 10 Regional offices to discuss QA issues approximately once per year or less. These visits are exclusive of the technical assistance visits discussed below. However, the technical assistance visits may negate the need

-4-

for separate Regional visits. Regional visits are not planned out at the beginning of the year; rather, the timing of the visit will be based in part on when the Region could use some help or a review, or in conjunction with other meetings near that location. Outstanding issues and circumstances may require additional Regional visits on occasion. If time permits during the Regional meetings, the contractor shall also answer general questions on any sites that are expected to be NPL candidates for future updates. (No additional preparation or reporting is required for NPL candidates for future updates consultations.)

When a Regional visit has been scheduled, the Regional NPL Coordinators or HQ RCs will submit new Documentation Record packages, if any, to the contractor at least three weeks in advance in order to give the contractor sufficient time to perform QA review and analyze issues on that package.

One week prior to the Regional visits, the contractor shall brief the HQ RC in detail on scoring issues, documentation problems, and other general deficiencies in that Region's HRS packages. At least 24 hours prior to the briefing, the contractor shall provide the HQ RC and the EPA TOM with a written review of the packages which the Region has submitted. The written review shall be in accordance with the EPA format provided (Attachment 1). The reviews shall consist of the contractor's analysis of data gaps and the adequacy of the documentation.

Task 4: Technical Assistance

The contractor shall respond to special requests for pre-HRS and HRS technical support to the Regions. The contractor's QA team member designated to a particular Region or site, or a contractor representative with experience in an area of particular interest to the Region, may provide the Region with technical support in the following areas: review file information on NPL candidate sites, advise the Region in preparing the HRS package for submittal to EPA, perform preliminary review of the draft HRS package, and give advice as to the options for revising the package. Should the HQ RC not be present in the Region, the QA team member shall contact the him/her if issues arise during the visit that need immediate resolution. The cost of these trips shall be charged site-specifically. Upon return from a Regional trip, the contractor shall prepare a report summarizing the issues on each site discussed during the trip. The report shall include any issues that need to be resolved by EPA Headquarters in order to enable the Region to proceed with preparation or revision of the HRS Documentation Record package.

Technical support could also include review of site investigations or sampling plans or participation in site screening discussions. Such support does not necessarily require a trip to the Region; discussion of technical review and consultation can be achieved through conference calls and written materials. Technical assistance will be tasked via technical direction by the EPA TOM.

Task 5: Meetings and Consultation with St/SI Center: Excepting for Subtask 4, this Task is being awarded to both contractors. The contractor shall support EPA as follows:

-5-

Subtask 1 - Status Meeting: As requested by the EPA TOM in a TD, the contractor shall attend meetings with EPA on the status of NPL Updates at EPA HQ. These meetings will be infrequent (up to 2 per year) since most status updates are easily conducted by phone. However, such meetings may be necessary prior to Federal Register publication. Meetings, as appropriate, shall be held between the contractor's QA team and the HQ RCs. In addition, the designated contractor's Regional contacts shall contact each of their 10 EPA Regional NPL Coordinators weekly (only if there is any HRS activity in the Region) to provide an update on the status of sites in the Region.

Subtask 2 - Pre-Rule Briefings: Prior to submittal of final QA packages, the contractor shall brief HQ on politically or technically sensitive candidate sites for the update. During this meeting, the contractor shall raise unresolved and outstanding QA issues, if any. The contractor shall estimate briefings on up to six sites during Option Year One.

Subtask 3 - Status Report: Each month a report on the status of all sites shall be delivered to the EPA TOM who will distribute to the Center Director and HQ RCs. The report shall be delivered on the last business day of each month unless specified otherwise by the EPA TOM. This report shall be delivered to the EPA TOM in electronic format. After comment or concurrence from the EPA TOM (approximately 3 days following delivery date of status report), the contractor shall send an updated status report to the NPL Coordinators in each region.

Subtask 4 - Conference Support: This work will be competed on an as needed basis between MNG and DynCorp. The contractor shall attend conference meetings in support of HRS and NPL work being performed under this task order. Contractor participation/attendance will be requested and approved by EPA 16 calendar days prior to the conference. EPA will issue TD(s) requesting participation in and support for specific meetings during these conferences. For planning purposes, the contractor shall provide conference support (up to two per year) one in each Region 5 and Region 6, each lasting three days.

Task 6: Research and Analysis of HRS Documentation Records

This Task is being awarded to both contractors. The contractor shall respond to up to four special requests for research and analysis of HRS Documentation Records. The requests are highly variable and may range from 2 hours to 200 hours. This research and analysis may be in response to inquiries from Congress, other government agencies or EPA management or may be in support of reauthorization activities. This research and analysis could apply to all sites proposed under the original and revised HRS and sites that are currently undergoing QA review. The research could, but not always will, begin with a database search for a certain subset of sites and might include research into the HRS Documentation Records to further narrow down the subset of sites (for example, finding all sites listed based on contaminated sediments). This research and analysis will be requested in a TD by the EPA TOM.

- 6 -

Task 7: Streamlined QA of HRS Documentation Records

The contractor shall perform a streamlined QA on HRS Documentation Record packages. This review is designed to address major issues and ensure a supportable score, but not provide some of the QA details needed for more complicated sites. Sites are typically one pathway. Streamlined QA review will be tasked by the EPA TOM via technical direction on a site-specific basis. The TD will include guidance for performing the QA for that specific site but will follow generally the format in the attached SOP (Attachment 2). For cost estimation purposes, each contractor shall estimate one QA in each region, but up to six in Region 6, of its total QA reviews performed during Option Year One will be streamlined QA.

4. TIME SCHEDULE AND DELIVERABLES

The deliverables shall be due as stated below. The contractor shall provide the EPA TOM with three copies of all deliverables and drafts. Associated word processing disks compatible with OERR software must also be provided upon completion of the task order.

Task 1: Work Plan

Within 15 days after receipt of Task Order

Monthly Progress Report

Due to EPA HQ on the 20th of each month

Task 2: Subtask 1

QA Letter - Due 20 business days after receipt of HRS package for a one pathway site plus an additional 5 business days for each additional pathway

Subtask 2

Teleconference Call Notes - Due within 3 business days following conference call

Subtask 3

Site Packages - Due within 5 business days following completion of QA review

Subtask 4

1. Support for NPL Rule Publication - Governor/State concurrence letter tracking report shall be submitted to EPA on the 25th (or closest business day) of each month.
2. Other NPL rule publication support activities should be completed at least one week prior to NPL rule publication.
3. Congressional letters shall be submitted at least one week prior to NPL rule publication.

-7-

Task 3: Headquarters Briefing - To be done 5 business days prior to Regional visit following issuance of TD which establishes visit date.

Written Review of Regional Packages and their Status - at least two business days prior to HQ briefing

Task 4: Technical Support Documents - Due upon completion and in accordance with schedule arranged with EPA TOM and HQ RC. The report summarizing the issues discussed on each site shall be due 5 business days after conclusion of the trip.

Task 5: Subtask 1
Status Meeting - Meeting upon request of EPA TOM by TD, without 3 business days.
Contact with EPA HQ RCs - Weekly (if HRS packages are being reviewed)

Subtask 2
Pre-Rule Briefings - No later than 10 business days prior to publication of proposed rules

Subtask 3
Monthly Status Report - Due by the last business day of each month in electronic format

Subtask 4
Contractor shall attend HRS and NPL-related conferences at EPA's request. A TD will be issued at least 16 calendar days prior to conference

Task 6: As specified in TD. Due between 1 and 14 days from issuance of TD depending on complexity of request.

Task 7: Will be specified in TD, but due generally 12 days from issuance of TD, depending on site.

5. CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE

During the first option year, the contractor will be rated twice. The first will be after six months, the second at the end of the option year. Rating will be in accordance with the attached contractor performance report (Attachment 3).

DYNCORP I&ET, INC.

EPA Contract No. 68-W-98-106

Monthly Progress Report

(5/1/98 - 5/31/98)

BASE PERIOD

Task Order Number:	DYN-002	Est. for Next Period: 900 hours
Task Order Title:	Support for NPL Updates	
EPA TOM:	T. Keidan / (703) 603-8852	
DynCorp I&ET, Inc. TOM:	J. Vescio / (703) 519-1474	
Percent Complete:	9.29% (Based on Level of Effort)	

Part 1. Activities undertaken during the month: Work under this task order was previously performed under EPA contract 68-W7-0051. Beginning May 1, 1998, the work was transferred to contract 68-W-98-106, Technical and Analytical Support for EPA's National Priorities List. Work performed for a number of sites within the QA review cycle was transferred to this contract; those sites are listed in the May 21, 1998 version of the monthly QA Status Summary Report.

For the first month of the new contract, the majority of the level of effort (LOE) was expended on the QA review of HRS packages for four sites: Charleston Boat Yard (Region 10), Federal Creosote (Region 2), Mid-Coast Marine (Region 10), and Midnite Mine (Region 2). Work on these sites accounted for 52 percent of the total site-specific charges to the work assignment. In addition, DynCorp performed QA review on 16 other sites.

The task order was received and a work plan and cost estimate for Dyn-002 was delivered on May 14, 1998. Under technical assistance, work continued on the Corinna Main Street site. Under the conference support subtask, Joe Vescio attended the National Site Assessment Conference in Denver, Colorado on May 26 and 27 to provide input during the NPL Coordinators' break out session. Finally, the QA Status Summary Report database was migrated into a Microsoft Windows compatible format and can now be delivered electronically to the EPA HQ TOM. A total of 15 deliverables were submitted for the period; five were submitted early, eight were submitted on time, one was submitted late (refer to Part 3, Issue and Resolutions, for more detail), and one had no due date.

During this reporting period, a total of 1,181 hours were expended at a total cost of \$49,052.30. The hours expended equal approximately 7.1 full time equivalents (FTE).

Task 1, Develop Work Plan: The EPA task order for Dyn-002 was received on April 30, 1998. The work plan and cost estimate were prepared and delivered ahead of schedule, on May 14, 1998. Task order monitoring, quality assurance, and task order management, were also performed during the reporting period by DynCorp I&ET. A total of 62 hours were charged at a cost of \$4,273.22 for this task. Please note that the "Other Expenses" in the monthly financial report consist of long distance telephone/fax charges.

Task 2, QA Review: During this reporting period, DynCorp received eight HRS packages for QA review:

Site Name	Region	Date Received	Submission
Lehigh Valley Railroad	2	5/4/98	Second
Little Creek NAB	3	5/4/98	Second
Federal Creosote	2	5/6/98	First
Computer Circuits	2	5/12/98	Fourth
Route 561 Dump	2	5/19/98	Second
North RR Avenue Plume	6	5/22/98	First
Omega Chemical	9	5/26/98	First
Lava Cap Mine	9	5/27/98	First

Subtask 1 -- QA letter

QA review activities were performed in support of 20 sites. A total of 930.5 hours, or approximately 78 percent of the charges to the task order, were site specific. Four sites, or 20 percent of the sites, accounted for 487 hours, or approximately 52 percent of the site-specific hours expended during this reporting period:

- Charleston Boat Yard (Region 10): 169.5 hours
- Federal Creosote (Region 2): 140.5 hours
- Mid-Coast Marine (Region 10): 91.5 hours
- Midnite Mine (Region 10): 85.5 hours

The average number of hours expended for the remaining 16 sites was 27.7 hours. DynCorp I&ET performed a number of streamlining activities during QA reviews to speed along the QA process. We performed a limited QA review (at the request of the EPA TOM) for the North Railroad Avenue Plume site and combined the QA review letters for the Charleston Boat Yard, Mid-Coast Marine, and Southern Oregon Marine sites to produce one QA letter with similar issues for the three sites.

Significant non-site-specific work was performed during this reporting period for a total of three hours. Work performed in this category includes general technical support and document review, continued implementation of internal guidelines and operating procedures, and communication, coordination and technical work for regional coordinators.

A total of 933.5 hours at a cost of \$34,708 was charged to the subtask.

Subtask 2 -- Conference Calls

Conference Calls were conducted for the following sites during the reporting period:

- Andrews Air Force Base: May 6, 1998
- Route 561 Dump: May 15, 1998
- Fox River: May 19, 1998
- Pownal Tannery: May 21, 1998

A total of 60.5 hours at a cost of \$3,658.59 was charged to the subtask.

Subtask 3 -- Submission of Site HRS Packages for EPA Approval

No activities were performed under this subtask during the period.

Subtask 4 -- Support for NPL Rule Publication

No activities were performed under this subtask during the period.

Task 3, Regional Visits: No activities were performed under this task during the period.

Task 4, Technical Assistance: DynCorp I&ET continued the technical assistance review of information for the Corinna Main Street site in Region 1. A total of 60.5 hours were charged by Ashley Jeffress, Kenyon Larsen, and William Chantry at a total cost of \$2,107.39.

Task 5, Meetings and Consultation with St/SI Center:

Subtask 1 -- Status Meeting

No activities were performed under this subtask during the period.

Subtask 2 -- Pre-Rule Briefings

No activities were performed under this subtask during the period.

Subtask 3 -- Status Report

The monthly QA Status Report for April/May was delivered to EPA Headquarters on May 21, 1998; pending the EPA TOM's approval, the QA Status Regional Report will be delivered in early June. A total of 7 hours was charged by Joe Vescio for preparation of the report at a total cost of \$465.78. In addition, Terry Keidan (the EPA HQ TOM) tasked DynCorp I&ET in a TDD to revise the monthly status report and transfer site status information into a new Windows compatible database. This transfer facilitates sending the report to the EPA TOM electronically. A total of 41.5 hours, at a cost of \$2,761.41, was charged by Valerie Schutz.

Subtask 4 -- Conference Support

As requested by the EPA TOM in a TDD, Joe Vescio attended the National Site Assessment Conference in Denver, Colorado on May 26 and 27 to provide assistance during the NPL Coordinators' meeting. A total of 16 hours at a cost of \$1,227.06 was charged to this subtask.

Task 6, Research and Analysis of HRS Documentation Records: No activities were performed under this task during the period.

Part 2. **Deliverables:** A total of 15 deliverables were submitted for the period; five were submitted early, eight were submitted on time, one was submitted late, and one had no due date.

Deliverable Title	Due Date	Modified Due Date	Date Submitted	Submitted to
QA Review, 1st Submission, Sanford Gasification Plant, Region 4	5/4/98	N/A	5/1/98	Barbara Vanderner
QA Review, 2nd Submission, Brandywine DRMO, Region 3	5/6/98	N/A	5/6/98	Marti Otto
Technical Review of Preliminary Info., Motor Fuels Corporation, Region 6	N/A	N/A	5/7/98	Barbara Vanderner
Technical Assistance Trip Report, Corinna Main Street, Region 1	5/8/98	N/A	5/8/98	Randy Hippen
QA Review, 1st Submission, Pools Prairie, Region 7	5/8/98	N/A	5/13/98	Mary Ann Rich
Work Plan and Cost Estimate, Task Order Dyn-002	5/15/98	N/A	5/14/98	Mary Ann Rich Jeanne Poovey Terry Keldan

Deliverable Title	Due Date	Modified Due Date	Date Submitted	Submitted to
Transfer of QA Status Summary Report from DOS-based to Windows Format	5/15/98	N/A	5/15/98	Terry Keidan
QA Review, Teleconference Format, Fox River, Region 5	5/19/98	N/A	5/19/98	Bob Myers
First QA Review Status Summary Report (electronic format), including telecon report	5/31/98	N/A	5/21/98	Terry Keidan
Approach for performing streamlined QA review of Region 6 packages (electronic format)	5/20/98	N/A	5/20/98	Bob Myers
QA Review, 1st Submission, American Brass, Region 4	5/20/98	N/A	5/20/98	Barbara Vandermer
QA Review, 1st Submissions, Mid-Coast Marine, Charleston Boat yard, Southern Oregon Marine, Region 10	5/22/98	N/A	5/22/98	Bob Myers
QA Review, 1st Submission, Federal Creosote, Region 2	6/2/98	N/A	5/26/98	Terry Keidan
QA Review, 4th Submission Nansmond Ordnance Depot, Region 3	5/26/98	N/A	5/26/98	Marti Otto
QA Review, 1st Submission, Midnite Mine, Region 10	5/27/98	N/A	5/27/98	Bob Myers

Part 3. Issues and Resolutions: The QA review letter for the Pools Prairie site in Region 7 was delivered late for the following reason: during a conference call with the Region and EPA HQ, it was decided that the documentation record needed to be restructured. HQ and the Region decided that the QA review letter should focus on restructuring the documentation record, not on specific QA issues. The QA letter was rewritten, making it late for delivery.

Part 4. Activities anticipated during the next month: Activities will continue on QA review, technical assistance, and preparation for the next NPL rule publication, including preparation of EPA briefings, congressional letters, and public documents.

Part 5. Lagging costs: Computer costs will lag one month behind throughout this task order. The long distance travel costs associated with Joe Vescio's trip to the National Site Assessment Conference will be included in a future invoice.

Part 6. Changes in personnel: There were no changes in personnel during the period.

of pages ► 77

To Jason Reed	From Crystal Ford
Dep't/Agency ASRC Reg A	Phone # 103-1223-9073
Fax # 415-764-4963	Fax # 103-1223-9100
NSN 7540-01-317-7368 5099-101	GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Est. for Next Period: 750 hours

Subtask 1 -- QA letter

QA review activities were performed in support of 22 sites. Four sites, or 18 percent of the sites, accounted for 321 hours, or approximately 44 percent of the site-specific hours expended during this reporting period:

- Lava Cap Mine (Region 9): 105 hours
- Pownal Tannery (Region 1): 76.5 hours
- Omega Chemical (Region 9): 71.5 hours
- North Railroad Avenue Plume (Region 6): 68 hours

The average number of hours expended for the remaining 18 sites was 18.3 hours. The QA review letters for all four sites listed above were delivered during the reporting period.

A total of 650.4 hours at a cost of \$29,443.61 was charged to the subtask.

Subtask 2 -- Conference Calls

Conference Calls were conducted for the following sites during the reporting period:

- Pownal Tannery (Region 1)
- Nansemond Ordnance Depot (Region 3)
- Fox River (Region 5)
- Pemaco Maywood (Region 9)
- Federal Creosote (Region 2)
- North Railroad Avenue Plume (Region 6)

A total of 63.5 hours at a cost of \$2,874.65 was charged to the subtask.

Subtask 3 -- Submission of Site HRS Packages for EPA Approval

The documentation record, HRS score sheets, and narrative summary for the Little Creek Naval Amphibious Base site in Region 3 were reviewed and prepared for delivery to EPA Headquarters as part of the submission for NPL Update 25.

A total of 19 hours at a cost of \$860.13 was charged to the subtask.

Subtask 4 -- Support for NPL Rule Publication

Congressional form letters written to congresspersons or senators whose states/districts contain sites being proposed or listed on the NPL were prepared and delivered to the EPA TOM. In addition, the narrative summaries for sites being proposed were edited and delivered to the Regions for final comment. Once comments were received, the narrative summaries were revised and delivered to the EPA TOM for inclusion in NPL Update 25. In addition, work began on the public documents for the NPL Proposed Update 25 and Final Rule 21.

A total of 31 hours at a cost of \$1,403.37 was charged to the subtask.

Subtask 5 -- Non-Site-Specific QA Work

Significant non-site-specific work was performed during this reporting period for a total of 66.1 hours, at a cost of \$2,992.35. Work performed in this category includes general technical support and document review, continued implementation of internal guidelines and operating procedures, and communication, coordination and technical work for regional coordinators.

Task 3, Regional Visits: No activities were performed under this task during the period.

Task 4, Technical Assistance: DynCorp I&ET continued the technical assistance review of information for the Northwest Oil Drain site in Region 8. A total of 46 hours was charged by Ashley Jeffress and Steve Kral at a total cost of \$1,658.96.

Task 5, Meetings and Consultation with SVSI Center:

Subtask 1 -- Status Meeting

No activities were performed under this subtask during the period.

Subtask 2 -- Pre-Rule Briefings

DynCorp I&ET presented briefings for the following sites at EPA Headquarters on June 16 or 24:

- Andrews Air Force Base (Region 3)
- Brandywine DRMO (Region 3)
- Computer Circuits (Region 2)
- Davis Park Road TCE (Region 4)
- Evergreen Manor Ground Water Contamination (Region 5)
- Federal Creosote (Region 2)
- Fox River (Region 5)
- Indian Refinery - Texaco Lawrenceville (Region 5)
- Lehigh Valley Railroad (Region 2)
- Little Creek Naval Amphibious Base (Region 3)
- Nansemond Ordnance Depot (Region 3)
- North Railroad Avenue Plume (Region 6)
- Pemaco Maywood (Region 9)
- Route 561 Dump (Region 2)

The effort involved the preparation of one to two-page briefing papers, which were then presented to David Evans, Director of the State, Tribal and Site ID center, to inform him of the history and possible weaknesses in the HRS packages for sites being proposed in the next NPL update.

A total of 173.5 hours (an average of 12.4 hours per site) at a cost of \$6,624.23 was charged to the subtask.

Subtask 3 -- Status Report

The monthly QA Status Report, including detailed report, report matrix, and telecon summary for June was delivered to EPA Headquarters on June 30, 1998; pending the EPA TOM's approval, the QA Status Regional Report will be delivered in early July. A total of 10 hours was charged by Joe Vescio for preparation of the reports at a total cost of \$381.80. ✓

Subtask 4 -- Conference Support

No activities were performed under this subtask during the period.

Task 6, Research and Analysis of HRS Documentation Records: No activities were performed under this task during the period.

Part 2. **Deliverables:** A total of 19 deliverables and the monthly technical report were submitted for the period; five were submitted early, six were submitted on time, and nine had no due dates.

Deliverable Title	Due Date	Modified Due Date	Date Submitted	Submitted to
QA Review, 2nd Submission, Lehigh Valley Railroad, Region 2	6/2/98	N/A	6/1/98	Terry Keidan

Deliverable Title	Due Date	Modified Due Date	Date Submitted	Submitted to
QA Status Summary, Regional Reports	N/A	N/A	6/3/98	NPL Coordinators, EPA Regions 1-10
Reference 28 of the Nansermond Ordnance Depot HRS Package	N/A	N/A	6/1/98	Kevin Wood, EPA Region 3
QA Review, 4th Submission (Telecon Format), Computer Circuits, Region 2	6/12/98	N/A	6/5/98	Terry Keidan
QA Review, 2nd Submission, Little Creek NAB, Region 3	6/5/98	N/A	6/5/98	Marti Otto
QA Review, 1st Submission, North Railroad Avenue Plume, Region 6	6/9/98	N/A	6/10/98	Bob Myers
QA Review, 2nd Submission, Route 561 Dump, Region 2	6/16/98	N/A	6/16/98	Terry Keidan
QA Review, 2nd Submission, Pownal Tannery, Region 1	6/17/98	N/A	6/17/98	Randy Hippen
Revised Status Spreadsheet, Governor/State Support Letters	6/19/98	N/A	6/19/98	Terry Keidan
Monthly Progress Report	6/22/98	N/A	6/22/98	Mary Ann Rich Jeanne Poovey
QA Review, 1st Submission, Omega Chemical Corp, Region 9	6/23/98	N/A	6/22/98	Terry Keidan
NPL Update 25 Narrative Summaries	N/A	N/A	6/22/98	Ben Conetta, EPA Region 2
NPL Update 25 Narrative Summaries	N/A	N/A	6/22/98	Kevin Wood, EPA Region 3
NPL Update 25 Narrative Summaries	N/A	N/A	6/22/98	Cindy Gurley, EPA Region 4
NPL Update 25 Narrative Summaries	N/A	N/A	6/22/98	Jeanne Griffin, EPA Region 5
NPL Update 25 Narrative Summaries	N/A	N/A	6/22/98	Brenda Cook, EPA Region 6

Deliverable Title	Due Date	Modified Due Date	Date Submitted	Submitted to
NPL Update 25 Narrative Summaries	N/A	N/A	6/22/98	Carolyn Douglas, EPA Region 9
QA Review, 1st Submission, Lava Cap Mine, Region 9	7/1/98	N/A	6/26/98	Terry Keidan
Congressional Letters for Proposed NPL Update 25 and Final Rule 21	N/A	N/A	6/30/98	Terry Keidan
QA Review Second Status Summary Report	6/30/98	N/A	6/30/98	Terry Keidan

Part 3. Issues and Resolutions: No issues were encountered during the reporting period.

Part 4. Activities anticipated during the next month: Activities will continue on QA review, technical assistance, and preparation for the next NPL rule publication, including final preparation of EPA public information documents.

Part 5. Lagging costs: Computer costs will lag one month behind throughout this task order. The long distance travel costs associated with Joe Vescio's trip to the National Site Assessment Conference in May will be included in a future invoice.

Part 6. Changes in personnel: Jennifer Horrocks, Region 5 Coordinator, resigned from DynCorp I&ET to relocate to Fort Collins, Colorado. Barbara Stitt is our new Region 5 Coordinator. In addition, Ashley Jeffress (Region 8 Coordinator) has relocated to Avon, Colorado, but is still working for DynCorp. We have reassigned the Region 8 Coordinator position to Amy DeMasi.

DYNCORP I&ET, INC.

EPA Contract No. 68-W-98-106

Monthly Progress Report

(7/1/98 - 7/31/98)

BASE PERIOD

Task Order Number: DYN-002 **Est. for Next Period:** 750 hours
Task Order Title: Support for NPL Updates
EPA TOM: T. Keidan / (703) 603-8852
DynCorp I&ET, Inc. TOM: J. Vescio / (703) 519-1474
Percent Complete: 35% (Based on Level of Effort)

Part 1. Activities undertaken during the month: The majority of the level of effort (LOE) under QA Review was expended on the review of HRS packages for four sites: Leviathan Mine (Region 9), Hiteman Leather (Region 2), Mohonk Road Industrial Plant (Region 2), and U.S. Avenue Burn (Region 2). Work on these sites accounted for 57 percent of the total site-specific charges to the work assignment. In addition, DynCorp I&ET, Inc. (DynCorp) performed QA review on 12 other sites.

Under technical assistance, work continued on the Anaconda Copper site in Region 8. In addition, Kenyon Larsen traveled to EPA Region 9 for a technical assistance visit on July 20 through 23, and William Chantry traveled to EPA Region 5 for a technical assistance visit on July 6 and 7.

A total of 12 deliverables and the monthly technical report were submitted for the period; all were submitted on time. During this reporting period, a total of 864.7 hours were expended at a total cost of \$41,194.18.

Task 1, Develop Work Plan: Task order monitoring, quality assurance, and management were performed during the reporting period by DynCorp. One hour was charged at a cost of \$675.52 for this task. Please note that during the last reporting period, 11 hours were charged at a professional rate that should have been charged as clerical labor. Those charges have been corrected in this invoice. In addition, please note that the "Other Expenses" in the monthly financial report consist of long distance telephone/fax charges. *\$12.17*

Task 2, QA Review: During this reporting period, a total of 572 hours, or approximately 78 percent of the charges to the task, were site specific. DynCorp received six HRS packages for QA review during the period:

Site Name	Region	Date Received	Submission
Little Creek NAB	3	7/3/98	Fourth
Federal Creosote	2	7/6/98	Third
Middlesex Sampling Plant	2	7/14/98	First
Mohonk Rd. Industrial Plant	2	7/15/98	First
Macalloy Corporation	4	7/24/98	First
Solitron Devices, Inc.	4	7/30/98	First

Subtask 1 - QA letter

QA review activities were performed in support of 16 sites. Four sites, or 25 percent of the sites, accounted for 326 hours, or approximately 57 percent of the site-specific hours expended during this reporting period:

- Leviathan Mine (Region 9): 108.5 hours
- Hiteman Leather (Region 2): 78.5 hours
- Mohonk Road Industrial Plant (Region 2): 75 hours
- U.S. Avenue Burn (Region 2): 64 hours

The average number of hours expended for the remaining 12 sites was 20.5 hours. The QA review letters for Leviathan Mine, Hiteman Leather, and U.S. Avenue Burn were delivered during the reporting period.

A total of 470 hours at a cost of \$20,858.60 was charged to the subtask.

Subtask 2 -- Conference Calls

Conference calls were conducted for the following sites during the reporting period:

- Lava Cap Mine (Region 9)
- Sanford Gasification Plant (Region 4)
- Pools Prairie (Region 7)
- Charleston Boat Yard (Region 10)
- Southern Oregon Marine (Region 10)
- Eastland Woolen Mills (Region 1)
- U.S. Avenue Burn (Region 2)
- Leviathan Mine (Region 9)

A total of 100 hours at a cost of \$4,438 was charged to the subtask.

Subtask 3 -- Submission of Site HRS Packages for EPA Approval

The documentation record, HRS score sheets, and narrative summary for the Route 561 Dump site in Region 2 were reviewed and prepared for delivery to EPA Headquarters as part of the submission for NPL Update 25.

A total of 2 hours at a cost of \$88.76 was charged to the subtask.

Subtask 4 -- Support for NPL Rule Publication

The public documents that are published when the proposed and final rules are published in the *Federal Register* were completed during the period. *Descriptions of 14 Sites Proposed to the National Priorities List in July 1998, Descriptions of 10 Final Sites Added to the National Priorities List in July 1998, Background Information: National Priorities List, Proposed Rule and Final Rule, and Supplementary Materials: National Priorities List, Proposed Rule and Final Rule* were completed and delivered to EPA headquarters on July 31, 1998.

A total of 14 hours at a cost of \$621.32 was charged to the subtask.

Subtask 5 -- Non-Site-Specific QA Work

Significant non-site-specific work was performed during this reporting period for a total of 147.7 hours, at a cost of \$6,501.24. Work performed in this category includes general technical support and document review, continued implementation of internal guidelines and operating procedures, and communication, coordination and technical work for regional coordinators.

Task 3, Regional Visits: No activities were performed under this task during the period.

Task 4, Technical Assistance: DynCorp continued the technical assistance review of information for the Anaconda Copper site in Region 8. In addition, William Chantry traveled to Chicago, Illinois to meet with EPA Region 5 and staff from the State of Illinois to discuss HRS scoring scenarios for the Sauget Area 2 and Matthiessen and Hegeler Zinc Co. sites. Kenyon Larsen traveled to San Francisco, California to meet with EPA Region 9 and their contractor to discuss HRS scoring scenarios for 18 different sites in Region 9. A total of 147.5 hours was charged at a total cost of \$7,391.23.

Task 5, Meetings and Consultation with SVSI Center: During the last reporting period, 32.5 hours were incorrectly charged under Task 5. Those hours and charges were moved to Task 2, QA Review, and are reflected in the current invoice. Because of the correction, -15.5 hours are charged to this task.

Seems high.
JoEV.

OK

No activities were performed under this subtask during the period.

Subtask 2 -- Pre-Rule Briefings

No activities were performed under this subtask during the period.

Subtask 3 -- Status Report

The monthly QA Status Report, including detailed report, report matrix, and telecon summary for July was delivered to EPA Headquarters on July 31, 1998; pending the EPA TOM's approval, the QA Status Regional Report will be delivered in early August. A total of 17 hours was charged by Joe Vescio for preparation of the reports.

Subtask 4 -- Conference Support

No activities were performed under this subtask during the period.

Task 6, Research and Analysis of HRS Documentation Records: No activities were performed under this task during the period.

Part 2. Technical Direction Forms Received:

Task No.	TDF Number	Date Received	Description
Task 2, QA Review	5	7/28/98	Consolidation of the four public information documents in two documents.
Task 2, QA Review	6	7/30/98	Review of MNG's synopsis of a telephone conversation concerning the North Belmont Plume site.

Part 3. Deliverables: A total of 12 deliverables and the monthly progress report were submitted for the period; all were submitted on time.

Deliverable Title	Due Date	Modified Due Date	Date Submitted	Submitted to
Narrative Summaries for Proposed NPL Update 25	7/2/98	N/A	7/2/98	Terry Keidan
Possible HRS Scoring Scenarios for the Northwest Oil Drain Site, Region 8	7/2/98	N/A	7/2/98	Jennifer Griesert
QA Status Summary, Regional Report	7/6/98	N/A	7/6/98	NPL Coordinators, Regions 1 - 10
Public Documents for NPL Proposed Rule and Final Rule	7/7/98	N/A	7/7/98	Terry Keidan

Deliverable Title	Due Date	Modified Due Date	Date Submitted	Submitted to
Region 5 Technical Assistance Trip Report	7/14/98	N/A	7/14/98	Bob Myers
QA Review, 1st Submission, U.S. Avenue Burn Site, Region 2	7/14/98	N/A	7/14/98	Terry Keidan
QA Review, 1st Submission, Leviathan Mine Site, Region 9	7/14/98	N/A	7/14/98	Terry Keidan
QA Review, 2nd Submission, Hiteman Leather Company Site, Region 2	7/15/98	N/A	7/15/98	Terry Keidan
Revised Status Spreadsheet, Governor/State Support Letters	7/16/98	N/A	7/16/98	Terry Keidan
Monthly Progress Report	7/20/98	N/A	7/20/98	Mary Ann Rich Jeanne Poovey
QA Review, 2nd Submission, Mid-Coast Marine, Charleston Boat Yard, and Southern Oregon Marine Sites, Region 10 (Telecon Format)	7/24/98	N/A	7/24/98	Bob Myers
Response to Technical Direction #6, Review of MNG's Synopsis of Telephone Conversation	7/31/98	N/A	7/31/98/98	Terry Keidan
QA Review Third Status Summary Report	7/31/98	N/A	7/31/98	Terry Keidan

Part 4. Issues and Resolutions: No issues were encountered during the reporting period.

Part 5. Activities anticipated during the next month: Activities will continue on QA review, technical assistance, and preparation for the next NPL rule publication, which may be in September.

Part 6. Lagging costs: Computer costs will lag one month behind throughout this task order. The long distance travel costs associated with Kenyon Larsen's trip to San Francisco and William Chantry's trip to Chicago in July will be included in a future invoice.

Part 7. Changes in personnel: There were no changes in personnel during the period.

DYNACORP I&ET, INC.

EPA Contract No. 68-W-98-106

Monthly Progress Report

(8/1/98 - 8/31/98)

BASE PERIOD

Task Order Number: DYN-002 Est. for Next Period: 900 hours
 Task Order Title: Support for NPL Updates
 EPA TOM: T. Keidan / (703) 603-8852
 DynCorp I&ET, Inc. TOM: J. Vescio / (703) 519-1474
 Percent Complete: 40% (Based on Level of Effort)

Part 1. Activities undertaken during the month: The majority of the level of effort (LOE) under QA Review was expended on the review of HRS packages for four sites: Macalloy Corporation (Region 4), City of Perryton Well No. 2 (Region 6), Smithtown Ground Water Contamination (Region 2), and Middlesex Sampling Plant (Region 2). Work on these sites accounted for 62 percent of the total site-specific charges to the work assignment. In addition, DynCorp I&ET, Inc. (DynCorp) performed QA review on 15 other sites.

Under technical assistance, work continued on the ISR/Anaconda Copper site in Region 8. Amy DeMasi travelled to EPA Region 8 in Denver, Colorado on August 17 through 20 to review HRS scoring information for the ISR/Anaconda site and to review information for two other potential NPL sites.

In late July, DynCorp was tasked to review and revise the public documents published during NPL rule publication. These documents were consolidated from four into two documents and were delivered to EPA Headquarters in Mid-August.

A total of 11 deliverables and the monthly technical report were submitted for the period; five were submitted early, four were submitted on time, and two had no due date. During this reporting period, a total of 843.6 hours were expended at a total cost of \$42744.62.

Task 1, Develop Work Plan: Task order monitoring, quality assurance, and management were performed during the reporting period by DynCorp. A total of 32.5 hours was charged at a cost of \$2,389.82 for this task. In addition, please note that the "Other Expenses" in the monthly financial report consist of long distance telephone/fax charges.

Task 2, QA Review: During this reporting period, a total of 651.3 hours, or approximately 77 percent of the charges to the task, were site specific. DynCorp received 13 HRS packages for QA review during the period:

Site Name	Region	Date Received	Submission
City of Perryton Well No. 2	6	8/3/98	First
Mohonk Rd. Industrial Plant	2	8/14/98	Second
Smithtown GW Contamination	2	8/14/98	First
Pownal Tannery	1	8/17/98	Fourth
Newton County Wells	7	8/18/98	First
Hiteman Leather	2	8/19/98	Third
U.S. Avenue Burn	2	8/25/98	Second
Copper Basin Mining Dist.	4	8/24/98	First
ISR/Anaconda Copper	8	8/26/98	First
Southern Oregon Marine	10	8/27/98	Third
Mid-Coast Marine	10	8/28/98	Third
Charleston Boat Yard	10	8/28/98	Third
Middlesex Sampling Plant	2	8/28/98	Second

Do the low charges with proper ask to Sarah Darryl

Subtask 1 -- QA letter

QA review activities were performed in support of 19 sites. Four sites, or 21 percent of the sites, accounted for 359.6 hours, or approximately 62 percent of the site-specific hours expended during this reporting period:

- Macalloy Corporation (Region 4): 107 hours
- City of Perryton Well No. 2 (Region 6): 99.5 hours
- Smithtown Ground Water Contamination (Region 2): 93.4 hours
- Middlesex Sampling Plant (Region 2): 59.7 hours

The average number of hours expended for the remaining 15 sites was 17.6 hours. The QA review letters for Macalloy Corporation, City of Perryton, and Middlesex Sampling Plant were delivered during the reporting period.

A total of 612.3 hours at a cost of \$28,306.63 was charged to the subtask.

Subtask 2 -- Conference Calls

Conference calls were conducted for the following sites during the reporting period:

- Hiteman Leather (Region 2)
- Middlesex Sampling Plant (Region 2)
- Southern Oregon Marine (Region 10)
- Solitron Devices (Region 4)

A total of 39 hours at a cost of \$1,802.97 was charged to the subtask.

Subtask 3 -- Submission of Site HRS Packages for EPA Approval

No activities were performed under this subtask during the period.

Subtask 4 -- Support for NPL Rule Publication

In late July, DynCorp was tasked by EPA Headquarters to revise and consolidate the public documents published during NPL rulemaking. The documents were revised and consolidated because they contained much of the same information about Superfund and the NPL. The documents *Background Information: National Priorities List, Proposed Rule and Final Rule* and *Supplementary Materials: National Priorities List, Proposed Rule and Final Rule* were combined into one document. In addition, the documents that contain the site narrative summaries, *Descriptions of Sites Proposed to the National Priorities List* and *Descriptions of Final Sites Added to the National Priorities List* were combined into one document.

A total of 29.5 hours at a cost of \$1,363.79 was charged to the subtask.

Subtask 5 -- Non-Site-Specific QA Work

Significant non-site-specific work was performed during this reporting period for a total of 35.8 hours, at a cost of \$1,655.03. Work performed in this category includes general technical support and document review, continued implementation of internal guidelines and operating procedures, and communication, coordination and technical work for regional coordinators.

As noted in a previous monthly progress report, 2.5 hours were billed at an incorrect hourly rate during June for Jennifer Horrocks. The hours were backed out in July and 2.5 hours at the correct hourly rate are being charged in August to Task 2, at a cost of \$29.17. /8/

Task 3, Regional Visits: No activities were performed under this task during the period.

Task 4, Technical Assistance: Amy DeMasi travelled to EPA Region 8 in Denver, Colorado with Jennifer Griesert of EPA Headquarters. They met with Dave Williams (EPA Region 8 NPL Coordinator) and his contractor to discuss the ISR/ Anaconda HRS package. During the visit, Ms.

FROM US EPA/VERA (102/11: 20 01 10 10)

DeMasi reviewed scoring information for the site, and reviewed completed portions of the documentation record to provide input to the regional contractor. In addition, HRS scoring scenarios for the Ogden Railroad Yard and French Gulch sites were discussed.

A total of 72 hours at a cost of \$5,488.12 was charged to the task.

Task 5, Meetings and Consultation with ST/SI Center:

Subtask 1 -- Status Meeting

No activities were performed under this subtask during the period.

Subtask 2 -- Pre-Rule Briefings

No activities were performed under this subtask during the period.

Subtask 3 -- Status Report

The monthly QA Status Report, including detailed report, report matrix, and telecon summary for August was delivered to EPA Headquarters on August 28, 1998; pending the EPA TOM's approval, the QA Status Regional Report will be delivered in early September. A total of 22.5 hours at a cost of \$1,613.26 was charged by Joe Vescio for preparation of the reports. ✓

Subtask 4 -- Conference Support

No activities were performed under this subtask during the period.

As noted in a previous monthly progress report, .5 hours were billed at an incorrect hourly rate during June for Jennifer Horrocks. The hours were backed out in July and 0.5 hour is being charged at the correct hourly rate in August to Task 5, at a cost of \$5.83. 1/0

Task 6, Research and Analysis of HRS Documentation Records: No activities were performed under this task during the period.

Part 2. Technical Direction Forms Received:

Task No.	TDF Number	Date Received	Description
Task 2, QA Review	7	8/11/98	Review and respond to QA review-related questions from EPA Region 7
Task 2, QA Review	8	8/14/98	Stop QA review of the Solitron Devices HRS package in Region 4
Task 4, Tech. Asst.	9	8/15/98	Travel to Region 8 to perform early technical assistance on at least three sites
Task 6, Research & Analysis of Doc. Records	10	8/19/98	Review the Teledyne Semiconductor and Spectra Physics site listing files and provide copies of documents not available at the EPA docket
Task 2, QA Review	11	8/31/98	Resume QA review of the Solitron Devices HRS package.

Part 3. Deliverables: A total of 11 deliverables and the monthly technical report were submitted for the period; five were submitted early, four were submitted on time, and two had no due date.

Deliverable Title	Due Date	Modified Due Date	Date Submitted	Submitted to
QA Status Summary Regional Report	N/A	N/A	8/3/98	NPL Coordinators, Regions 1-10
Region 9 Technical Assistance Summary Report	8/3/98	N/A	8/3/98	Terry Keidan
QA Review, 1st Submission, Mohonk Rd. Industrial Plant, Region 2	8/12/98	N/A	8/10/98	Terry Keidan
QA Review, 1st Submission, Middlesex Sampling Plant, Region 2	8/11/98	N/A	8/10/98	Terry Keidan
Revised Status Spreadsheet for Governor/State Support Letters	8/13/98	N/A	8/13/98	Terry Keidan/ Bob Myers
Draft Combined Public Documents for NPL Proposed Rule and Final Rule	8/19/98	N/A	8/18/98	Terry Keidan
Monthly Progress Report	8/20/98	N/A	8/20/98	Mary Ann Rich Jeanne Poovey
QA Review, 1st Submission, Macalloy Corporation, Region 4	8/21/98	N/A	8/21/98	Barbara Vandermer
Region 8 Technical Assistance Summary Report	8/25/98	N/A	8/25/98	Terry Keidan
Explanation of Sample Quantitation Limits, Sanford Gasification Plant site, Region 4	N/A	N/A	8/26/98	Cindy Gurley, Region 4 NPL Coordinator
QA Status Summary Report	8/31/98	N/A	8/28/98	Terry Keidan
QA Review, 1st Submission, City of Perryton Well No. 2, Region 6	8/31/98	N/A	8/29/98	Barbara Vandermer

Part 4. Issues and Resolutions: No issues were encountered during the reporting period.

Part 5. Activities anticipated during the next month: Activities will continue on QA review, technical assistance, and preparation for the next NPL rule publication, which will be in late September.

Part 6. Lagging costs: Computer costs will lag one month behind throughout this task order. The long

distance travel costs associated with Amy DeMasi's trip to Denver, Colorado will be included in a future invoice.

Part 7. Changes in personnel: Lesa Pearson was hired and began work on the contract on August 31, 1998. She will be working on QA reviews and other projects under the different task orders. In addition, Kristen Knipling began work at DynCorp on August 17, 1998. Ms. Knipling will be working primarily under the Information Management task order on the contract. ✓

With the departure of Steve Kral, William Chantry has taken over the duties as Region 2 Coordinator for DynCorp.

DYNCORP I&ET, INC.

EPA Contract No. 68-W-98-106

Monthly Progress Report

(9/1/98 - 9/30/98)

BASE PERIOD

Task Order Number: DYN-002 **Est. for Next Period:** 600 hours
Task Order Title: Support for NPL Updates
EPA TOM: T. Keidan / (703) 603-8852
DynCorp I&ET, Inc. TOM: J. Vescio / (703) 519-1474
Percent Complete: 54.1% (Based on Level of Effort)

Part 1. Activities undertaken during the month: The majority of the level of effort (LOE) under QA Review was expended on the review of HRS packages for the following four sites: Copper Basin Mining District (Region 4), ISR/ Anaconda Copper (Region 8), Newton County Wells (Region 7), and Midnite Mine (Region 10). Work on these sites accounted for 58 percent of the total site-specific charges to the work assignment. In addition, DynCorp I&ET, Inc. (DynCorp) performed QA review on 16 other sites.

DynCorp assisted EPA Headquarters in the preparation for Proposed Update 26 to the National Priorities List (NPL). Narrative summaries, congressional letters, and public information documents for the update were prepared and delivered during the month.

DynCorp prepared and delivered the Contractor Performance Report for the task order in early September. We subsequently received the EPA TOM's review, in which DynCorp scored "Outstanding" in every category of the report.

A total of 17 deliverables and the monthly technical report were submitted for the period; four were submitted early, 10 were submitted on time, and three had no due date. During this reporting period, a total of 895.1 hours were expended at a total cost of \$42,782.52.

Task 1, Develop Work Plan: Task order monitoring, quality assurance, and management were performed during the reporting period by DynCorp. A total of 44.5 hours was charged at a cost of \$2,676.11 for this task.

Task 2, QA Review: During this reporting period, a total of 677.4 hours, or approximately 84 percent of the charges to the task, were site specific. DynCorp received eight HRS packages for QA review during the period:

Site Name	Region	Date Received	Submission
Lava Cap Mine	9	9/1/98	Second
Midnite Mine	10	9/3/98	Second
City of Perryton Well No. 2	6	9/8/98	Second
Pownal Tannery	1	9/8/98	Fifth
Omega Chemical Corp.	9	9/10/98	Second
U.S. Avenue Burn	2	9/21/98	Third
Smithtown GW Contamination	2	9/21/98	Second
Pools Prairie	7	9/22/98	Second

Subtask 1 -- QA letter

QA review activities were performed in support of 20 sites. Four sites, or 20 percent of the sites, accounted for 369 hours, or approximately 58 percent of the site-specific hours expended during this reporting period:

- Copper Basin Mining District (Region 4): 118 hours
- ISR/Anaconda Copper Co. (Region 8): 99.5 hours
- Midnite Mine (Region 10): 83.8 hours

- Newton Co. Wells (Region 7): 80.7 hours

The average number of hours expended for the remaining 16 sites was 16.7 hours. The QA review letters for Copper Basin Mining District, ISR/Anaconda Copper Co., Midnite Mine, and Newton Co. Wells were delivered during the reporting period.

A total of 635.9 hours at a cost of \$27,133.85 was charged to the subtask.

Subtask 2 -- Conference Calls

Conference calls were conducted for the following sites during the reporting period:

- Pownal Tannery (Region 1)
- Omega Chemical Corporation (Region 9)
- Midnite Mine (Region 10)
- ISR/Anaconda Copper Co. (Region 8)
- Mohonk Road Industrial Plant (Region 2)
- Smithtown Ground Water Contamination (Region 2)

A total of 32.5 hours at a cost of \$1,386.76 was charged to the subtask.

Subtask 3 -- Submission of Site HRS Packages for EPA Approval

Final documentation records and HRS score sheets were prepared and delivered to EPA headquarters for the Middlesex Sampling (Region 2) and Lava Cap Mine (Region 9) sites. A total of nine hours, at a cost of \$384.03, was charged to the subtask.

Subtask 4 -- Support for NPL Rule Publication

During September, DynCorp supported EPA Headquarters in the publication of Proposed Update 26 of the NPL. Narrative summaries for those sites to be included in the update were delivered to the respective EPA Regions for final comment and then delivered to the EPA TOM. In addition, letters were prepared for those Congress Persons and Senators that had future NPL sites located in their congressional districts or states. In addition, the public information documents were finalized and posted on the Internet at the time of publication of the proposed rule.

A total of 43.5 hours at a cost of \$1,856.15 was charged to the subtask.

Subtask 5 -- Non-Site-Specific QA Work

Significant non-site-specific work was performed during this reporting period for a total of 87.7 hours, at a cost of \$3,742.16. The hours during the period increased from last month because of the increased coordination with the Regions during the NPL proposed update. Work performed in this category includes general technical support and document review, continued implementation of internal guidelines and operating procedures, and communication, coordination and technical work for regional coordinators.

Task 3, Regional Visits: No activities were performed under this task during the period.

Task 4, Technical Assistance: No activities were performed under this task during the period. Please note that outstanding travel costs for Amy Demasi's trips Atlanta, GA and Denver CO to provide technical assistance are included this billing period. Refer to the Detailed Travel Report for further explanation of the charges.

Task 5, Meetings and Consultation with ST/SI Center:

Subtask 1 -- Status Meeting

No activities were performed under this subtask during the period.

Subtask 2 -- Pre-Rule Briefings

No activities were performed under this subtask during the period.

Subtask 3 -- Status Report

The monthly QA Status Report, including detailed report, report matrix, and telecon summary for September was delivered to EPA Headquarters on September 30, 1998; pending the EPA TOM's approval, the QA Status Regional Report will be delivered in early October. A total of 22 hours at a cost of was charged by Joe Vescio for preparation of the reports.

In addition, briefing reports were prepared and delivered to EPA Headquarters for those sites included in NPL Update 26. A total of 20 hours was charged for this support.

A total of 42 hours, at a cost of \$2,426.18, was charged to the subtask.

Subtask 4 -- Conference Support

No activities were performed under this subtask during the period.

Task 6, Research and Analysis of HRS Documentation Records: No activities were performed under this task during the period.

Part 2. Technical Direction Forms Received:

Task No.	TDF Number	Date Received	Description
Task 2, QA Review	12	9/23/98	Tasked to make copies of HRS packages for two sites in Region 2: Hiteman Leather and Middlesex Sampling Plant
Task 4, Tech. Asst.	13	9/29/98	Travel to Montana to perform early technical assistance on the Tenmile Creek site

Part 3. Deliverables: A total of 17 deliverables and the monthly technical report were submitted for the period; four were submitted early, 10 were submitted on time, and three had no due date.

Deliverable Title	Due Date	Modified Due Date	Date Submitted	Submitted to
QA Status Summary Regional Report	9/2/98	N/A	9/2/98	NPL Coordinators, Regions 1-10
QA Review, 1st Submission, Smithtown GW Contamination, Region 2	9/11/98	N/A	9/2/98	Terry Keidan
QA Review, 2nd Submission, U.S. Avenue Burn, Region 2	9/8/98	N/A	9/4/98	Terry Keidan

Deliverable Title	Due Date	Modified Due Date	Date Submitted	Submitted to
QA Review, 1st Submission, ISR/Anaconda Copper Co.	9/11/98	N/A	9/8/98	Jennifer Griesert
Revised Status Spreadsheet for Governor/State Support Letters	9/15/98	N/A	9/15/98	Terry Keidan/ Bob Myers
QA Review, 1st Submission, Newton County Wells, Region 7	9/16/98	N/A	9/16/98	Mary Ann Rich
QA Review, 2nd Submission, Midnite Mine, Region 10 (Telecon format)	9/17/98	N/A	9/17/98	Bob Myers
QA Review, 1st Submission, Solitron Devices, Inc., Region 4	9/19/98	N/A	9/18/98	Barbara Vandermer
Monthly Progress Report	9/20/98	N/A	9/21/98*	Mary Ann Rich Jeanne Poovey
Narrative Summaries for Sites in NPL Update 26	N/A	N/A	9/21/98	Ben Conetta, EPA Region 2
Narrative Summaries for Sites in NPL Update 26	N/A	N/A	9/21/98	Brenda Cook, EPA Region 6
Narrative Summaries for Sites in NPL Update 26	N/A	N/A	9/21/98	Carolyn Douglas, EPA Region 9
Congressional Letters for Proposed NPL Update 26 and Final NPL Update 22	9/22/98	N/A	9/22/98	Terry Keidan
QA Review, 1st Submission, Copper Basin Mining District, Region 4	9/22/98	N/A	9/22/98	Barbara Vandermer
Final Review Briefings for Proposed NPL Update 26	9/23/98	N/A	9/23/98	Terry Keidan
Final Review Briefing for Smithtown GW Contamination site, Region 2	9/24/98	N/A	9/24/98	Terry Keidan
Site Narrative Summaries for Proposed NPL Update 26	9/24/98	N/A	9/24/98	Terry Keidan

Deliverable Title	Due Date	Modified Due Date	Date Submitted	Submitted to
QA Status Summary Report	9/30/98	N/A	9/30/98	Terry Keidan

*Because the monthly progress report due date (9/20/98) fell on a Sunday, the report was delivered on the next business day, 9/21/98.

- Part 4. Issues and Resolutions: No issues were encountered during the reporting period.
- Part 5. Activities anticipated during the next month: Activities will continue on QA review and technical assistance.
- Part 6. Lagging costs: Computer costs will lag one month behind throughout this task order. The long distance travel costs associated with Amy DeMasi's trip to Denver, Colorado will be included in a future invoice.
- Part 7. Changes in personnel: There were no changes in personnel during the period.